

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 11793**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Sadaaki HIRAI

Group Art Unit: 1793

Application No.: 10/526,434

Examiner: D. LIAO

Filed: March 3, 2005

Docket No.: 123048

For: HONEYCOMB CATALYST CARRIER AND METHOD FOR PRODUCTION
THEREOF

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the August 15, 2008 Office Action, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 21-37 are pending in this application. Claims 21-33 and 35-37 stand withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,157,007 to Domesle. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Domesle discloses all elements recited in claim 34, asserting that Domesle discloses disposing a porous outer wall followed by impregnation by an inorganic material, as recited in option IV listed in claim 34. In particular, the Office Action asserts that col. 6, lines 44-56 of Domesle discloses immersing the honeycomb structure in a slurry ("coating"), followed by impregnation using a metal ("inorganic

material"). The Office Action also asserts that claim 1 of Domesle discloses similar subject matter.

However, Domesle merely teaches deposition of the activity-enhancing support material on the channels of a monolithic or honeycombed inert carrier. See Domesle at col. 2, lines 46-50. While excessive coating material may be inadvertently placed on the outer peripheral wall when the monolithic or honeycombed inert carrier is coated by immersion, Domesle explicitly requires a blowing step to remove excessive coating material. See Examples 3-6 of Domesle. Thus, the excessive coated material on the outer peripheral wall is removed simultaneously at the time of blowing. Therefore, Domesle's outer peripheral wall is not coated with the activity-enhancing support when the monolithic or honeycombed inert carrier is immersed in a coating solution. Thus, no catalyst is coated on the outer peripheral wall. In this regard, see also Domesle at col. 2, lines 52-68, and the description in Examples 3-6. Indeed, the objective of the coating with the activity-enhancing support material in Domesle is only to provide a catalyst capable of operation in a continuous manner. See Domesle at col. 2, lines 27-41.

On the other hand, the subject matter recited in claim 34 aims to enhancing the mechanical strength of the honeycomb structure by preventing the catalytic components from permeating from the inner wall portions to the outer wall by forming the impregnated portions on the outer wall by impregnating a water-insoluble organic material and/or inorganic material into the outer wall. By doing so, the crack generation and the exfoliation of the outer wall from the cell structure is effectively prevented.

Furthermore, the porous wall as an outer peripheral wall on a honeycomb structure from which the original outer peripheral has been mechanically ground can not be formed merely by immersing such a honeycomb structure into a solution, since it is known for ordinary artisans that at least repeated coatings is required. Also, one of ordinary skill in the

ordinary artisans that at least repeated coatings is required. Also, one of ordinary skill in the honeycomb field understands that the catalyst should not be loaded on the outer peripheral wall since it does not help the purification of the exhaust gas. Thus, the amount of the catalyst unintentionally loaded on the outer peripheral wall is proposed to be minimized. See the description on page 26, line 15 to page 25, line 25 of the present specification. Thus, the Office Action's assertion that Domesle's immersion processes inherently produce an outer wall is a misreading of Domesle.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GL/wma

Date: November 7, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--